

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner erroneously attached the incorrect Information Disclosure Statement. The Information Disclosure Statement attached to the Office Action was filed by a New York firm and is not related to the present application. On October 19, 2005, in a separate correspondence via facsimile, Applicant notified the Examiner as to the erroneous Information Disclosure Statement. Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement on October 29, 2004, a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement on February 15, 2005, and a second Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement on May 17, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge the correct Information Disclosure Statements in the next official correspondence.

The Examiner failed to acknowledge Applicant's claim for foreign priority. Applicant claimed priority with the filing of the application under 35 U.S.C. 119 on the basis of Japanese Patent Application No. 2002-228948 filed August 6, 2002. Applicant mailed a certified copy of the foreign document on September 16, 2003. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge Applicant's claim for foreign priority and receipt of the priority document in the next official correspondence.

Claims 1-3 were amended. Claims 10-12 were added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1–4 (and Applicant assumes claim 6) under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Japan '227 (Japan 1-305227). Japan '227 does not teach all the limitations of claims 1–3. More specifically, Japan '227 does not teach "supplying...at

least any one of the high frequency and steam into the heating chamber to heat-treat the food object to the heated.” Referring to Fig. 1 and to the first full paragraph in the second last column on page 145 of Japan ‘227, Japan ‘227 discloses a microwave oven having a microwave cooking mode and a dishwashing mode. Thus, Japan ‘227 is a microwave oven and dishwasher. Japan ‘227 discloses that cooking is done in the microwave cooking mode with microwaves but is silent as to cooking with steam. Japan ‘227 further discloses that in the dishwashing mode, cleaning is accomplished with both water and steam and sometimes microwaves. The water and/or steam is shot out through the nozzles (2) and is drained out through the drain (5). The steam function in Japan ‘227 is for cleaning dishes and not heating food. Thus, Japan ‘227 does not teach heat treating a food object to the heated with high frequency or steam.

In regard to claims 2 and 3, Japan ‘227 does not teach “an evaporating dish.” As mentioned above, Japan ‘227 uses both water and steam in the dishwashing mode where the water and/or steam is shot out through the nozzles (2). Thus, Japan does not teach an evaporating dish. Further, Japan ‘227 does not teach “...an evaporating dish cleaning mode for pumping a cleaning liquid into the evaporating dish...to clean soil on the evaporating dish.” Japan ‘227 is silent on the use of a cleaning liquid to clean soil and discloses the use of only water and/or steam in the cleaning mode. Thus, Japan ‘227 does not teach pumping a cleaning liquid into the evaporating dish.

Therefore, Japan ‘227 does not teach all the limitations of claims 1–3.

Claims 4 and 6 depend from both claims 1 and 3, thus, all arguments pertaining to claims 1 and 3 are equally applicable to claim 4 and are herein incorporated by reference.

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 7–9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan ‘227 in view of Japan ‘843 (Japan 2001-355843).

Claims 5 and 7–9 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1–3, thus, all arguments pertaining to claims 1–3 are equally applicable to claims 5 and 7–9 and are herein incorporated by reference.

The cited references do not teach all the limitations of claims 10–12. More specifically, the cited references do not teach “wherein the food object to be heated is cooked by any one of the high frequency generating part and the steam generating part.”

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 35996.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:   
Michael W. Garvey – Reg. No. 35,878

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: December 29, 2005